UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,161	10/534,161 05/05/2005 Knut Kieschnick		DE02 0251 US	2596
65913 <b>NXP</b> , B.V.	7590 03/31/200	EXAMINER		
NXP INTELLE	ECTUAL PROPERTY	ABDIN, SHAHEDA A		
M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY	DRIVE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN JOSE, CA	A 95131	2629		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/31/2008	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/534,161	KIESCHNICK ET AI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SHAHEDA A. ABDIN	2629		

	SHAHE	DA A. ABDIN	2629	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ears on th	e cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>03 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PPLICATION	ON IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1 eal (with a	) an amendment, affidavit ppeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of th	e final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	Advisory Ac ater than S	tion, or (2) the date set forth i IX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (l MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sloset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and shortened s r than three	I the corresponding amount of tatutory period for reply origing.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	oliance wit	h 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion ther	eof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
 3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	but prior to	the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further con	nsideratio			
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	•	or appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	-	ding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		tached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s).		submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			be entered and an e	kplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: <u>None</u> .				
Claim(s) objected to: <i>None</i> . Claim(s) rejected: <i>1-3 and 7-17</i> .				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome	<u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	ıt does NC	T place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (label{eq:disclosure}).	(PTO/SB/	08) Paper No(s)		
/Richard Hjerpe/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629	Е	haheda A Abdin xaminer		
	Α	rt Unit: 2629		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As to claims 1 and 11, Applicant argues that,

Takahara's reference does not disclose "some of the control lines being connected to a plurality of delay units such that only every other
control line is connected to a particular delay unit, the delay unit being used to store row voltage values for the control lines connected to
the delay units until a clock signal is supplied to the delay units". However, Examiner disagree applicant's point of view. Note that
Takahara's reference clearly teaches the above limitations in that the some of the gate lines (i.e. X1, X3) being connected to a plurality of
delay units (i.e. 94) such that only every other gate lines is connected to a particular delay unit (i.e. particular delay units (respective Dflipflop) for every other gate lines), the delay units (i.e. 94 for respective gate lines) being used to store row voltage values for the control
lines connected to the delay units until a clock signal (GCKI) is supplied to the delay units" (column 11, lines 54-67, column 12, lines 1-30).

Applicant also argues that "the even numbered gate lines would be connected to simillar D flip-flops of the second gate driver 38b. Thus the cited reference of Takahara et al does not disclose the limitations of "only every other control line is connected to aparticular delay unit". However, Examiner disagree Applicant's point of view. Note that the limitation "particular delay unit" is broad, it dosnot exclude "simi delay units" such as simillar D flip-flops of the second gate driver 38b which is discloses at Takahara's reference because this claim

limitation does not render that particular delay units must be in such that each gate lines must have different delay unit that means the gate lines would not be connected to simillar delay unit. Further more, Takahara's reference teaches that only every other control lines (i.e. each odd gate lines or even gates lines) is connected to particular (respective) delay unit (D-flip-flop). Thus the reference of takahara meet the claim limitations. Same rationales are applicable to "every other data lines" as recited in claim11.